

up front shot, as I understand it, of \$8.5 million. Insofar as the bill funds the tort claim, after the settlement by the district court I think, there is no question about it, the Legislature has the clear authority to approve the claim and pay it and I believe this is what Senator DeCamp is suggesting with his amendment. Although the courts, as I understand it, never, never reached any decision as to the merits of the liability under the tort claim. This is a settlement and in the opinion of the Lancaster County District Court, a fair settlement. Now the contract claim is another matter and this is why I think I can and do rise in support of the DeCamp amendment. It's another matter given the fact that it has not received the approval of any court of law. As a matter of fact my attention was drawn last evening as I thought about this to the Majority Report of the Special Commonwealth Committee in which I might quote, insofar as the contract claim and the miscellaneous claim is concerned, liability is estimated at approximately zero, page 448 of the report. Another problem that I have with the second section, the part Senator DeCamp is trying to delete, is the fact that the funding mechanics in this amendment are, I think, very complex. As I look through it I didn't see, for example, where the state can buy back the State Office Building, for example, at the conclusion of this term for a dollar or whatever the case may be. That may not trouble some of you, but it certainly did raise a question in my mind. I think it might be more appropriate for us to bite the bullet in terms of an up front appropriation of \$8.5 million rather than selling the State Office Building and this is what we're going to be doing. I don't know, but I thought about it last evening and I wondered maybe the State Office Building is worth more than \$20.5 million. Think about it. I'm not sure anybody knows what it's worth. If so, if it is worth more than \$20.5, we're then betting, we're wagering that the bonds will be paid off, we'll get the State Office Building back, of course,...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR BARRETT: ...but if the bonds are not paid off and the State Office Building is worth more than \$20.5 million, then we have sold a state asset for less than its value to the detriment of the state, have we not? Finally, without an appraisal on the State Office Building and I don't know that one is available, we may be lending the credit to the